. , .	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/090,921	WILLIAMS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas M. Lithgow	1724
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Thomas M. Lithgow.	(3)	
(2) Mr. Guy Yale (29125).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 January 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's représentative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1-21		
Prior art documents discussed: Janik (US 6187188), Bailey (US 6001249), WO (02/13944)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER The examiner proposed cancel of claims 14-21 based on the prio clear antecedent basis - see Ex's amendment. Applicant agreed to	r art (above) and small changes t	
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate red 	examiner will provide a writte	en summary of the substance
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
- Sull-Posts -		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature - if appropriate)